



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,095	05/31/2001	Mark L. Roth	188277/US/2	3100
66083	7590	10/04/2007	EXAMINER	
SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC. c/o DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP			SANDOVAL, KRISTIN D	
370 SEVENTEENTH ST.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 4700			2132	
DENVER, CO 80202			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/873,095	ROTH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristin D. Sandoval	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-14 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-14 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 May 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent-Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-19 are pending. Claims 6 and 15 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed July 26, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Hunt fails to teach an application server embedding security registration data requirements in the user registration page request. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hunt discloses a web server associated with a registration agent web application that embeds a requirement for a username and password in the user's registration request (7:38-51, 8:24-35). Once a user requests to register, the web server receives the request since it includes the registration processing system, thus ensuring a requirement for a username and password are included (5:12-24).

Applicant further argues that Hunt fails to teach a web application merging the security registration data requirements with the user profile registration requirements. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hunt discloses a web application that presents a form that includes the request for username and password, along with other information needed by the site the user is registering with (7:38-51, 8:31-43). The username and password are security requirements and all other data required are requirements of the web application.

Finally applicant argues that Hunt fails to teach an application server extracting security data from a filled out user information page. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The web server extracts the username and password from the filled out form to include in the user's

personal profile stored in a master database which is located on the web server (5:12-24, 7:12-21). Since the username and password are stored in the profile they must first be extracted from the filled out form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-2, 10-11 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hunt et al. (Hunt), U.S. Patent No. 6,496,855.

As per claims 1-2, 10-11 and 19:

Hunt discloses a method comprising:

generating a user registration page request by a user of a web application and forwarding the user registration page request to an application server (5:51-55, 7:28-37, 8:15-26);

By the application server, embedding security data requirements in the user registration page request and forwarding the user registration page request to a user registration page of the web application (5:56-6:31, 7:38-51, 8:15-42);

By the user registration page of the web application, merging the security data requirements from the application server with the user profile registration requirements of the web application to form a user information request page (5:51-6:31);

Sending the user information request page from the web application to the user (7:37-51). returning a filled out user information request page to a pass through server target on the application server (5:56-6:43);

extracting security data from the filled out user information page by the application server and bootstrapping a user account in the user database by the application server based upon the extracted security data . Hunt discloses the use of an ID and password, provided by the user, to initiate a new user account in the database (5:12-24, 6:44-52, 8:15-42), which meets the limitation of bootstrapping a user account in the user database by the application server based upon the extracted security data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 3-5, 7-9, 12-14 and 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al. (Hunt), U.S. 6,496,855 as applied to claims 1 and 10 above and further in view of Levergood et al. (Levergood), U.S. Patent No. 5,708,780.

As per claims 3 and 12:

Levergood substantially teaches that "the authentication server checks to see if the user qualifies for a new account" (see column 6, line 67 -column 7, line 3), meeting the limitation of making available a set of user security requirements. It would have been obvious to check to see if a user qualified for a new account because this would protect the registration agent of Hunt from hackers and script programs from creating illegitimate accounts.

As per claims 4-5 and 13-14, Levergood substantially teaches a success target and a failure target to provide respective destinations for the bootstrap attempt. These targets are disclosed as URLs capable of being shown in a browser (see Figure 2B; column 7, lines 51-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have success and failure targets for the bootstrap attempt and to show them in a browser because this would inform the user of a successful or failed attempt to create their account within the database.

As per claims 7-9 and 16-18, Levergood substantially teaches merging the set of security registration requirements and user profile data requirements to collect corresponding user profile data from the user. They are forwarded back, extracted, and stored in a user profile database (see column 6, line 58 - column 7, line 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to collect and merge user profile data and security requirements because this would allow all of the users information to be in one place which would make it more convenient for users in giving them a central repository for all of their information (Hunt, 3:42-67).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristin D. Sandoval whose telephone number is 571-272-7958. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kristin D Sandoval
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

KPS
KDS


GILBERTO BARRON JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100